

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action dated October 25, 2007, claims 1 – 22 and 32 were allowed and claims 23 – 31 were rejected. In response, Applicants have amended claim 23. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amended claim and the below-provided remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation that claims 1 – 22 and 32 are allowed.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 23 – 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hama (U.S. Pat. Publ. No. 2004/0202171 A1) in view of Ishizaki et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,099,912 B2, hereinafter Ishizaki).

Claim 23

Applicants have amended claim 23 to include the limitation “redefining the explicitly identified set of VLAN IDs without having to redefine a set of VLAN IDs that result in traffic being forwarded within said customer-specific VPL.” Support for this amendment is found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, paragraph [0009].

Claim 23, as amended, recites:

“A method for managing network traffic comprising:
establishing a customer-specific virtual private local area network (VPL)
through a multiprotocol label switched (MPLS) domain;
explicitly identifying a set of virtual local area network (VLAN)
identifiers (IDs) for use with non-VPL traffic;
receiving traffic from a customer at a provider edge device (PE), wherein
said PE connects to other PEs via said MPLS domain;
examining said traffic to identify non-VPL traffic;
extracting identified non-VPL traffic from said customer-specific VPL;
forwarding the non-extracted traffic within said customer-specific VPL;
and
*redefining the explicitly identified set of VLAN IDs without having to
redefine a set of VLAN IDs that result in traffic being forwarded within said
customer-specific VPL.*” (emphasis added)

Applicants assert that neither Hama nor Ishizaki teach or suggest the newly added limitation. In particular, Applicants assert that both Hama and Ishizaki teach that a set of VLAN IDs that define a default service would have to be redefined if the set of VLAN IDs for a first (non-default) service were to be redefined. Because neither Hama nor Ishizaki teach or suggest “redefining the explicitly identified set of VLAN IDs without having to redefine a set of VLAN IDs that result in traffic being forwarded within said customer-specific VPL” as recited in amended claim 23, Applicants assert that amended claim 23 is not rendered obvious from Hama in view of Ishizaka.

Dependent Claims 24 – 31

Claims 24 – 31 depend from claim 23. Applicants assert that these claims are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 23.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: January 24, 2008

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111